

AIR WAR COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

MISSION FIRST, PEOPLE ALWAYS?

Managing the Millennial Generation

by

Michael A. Curley, Lt Col, US Air Force

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: Col Todd Westhauser, US Air Force, Retired

13 February 2016

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government, the Department of Defense, or Air University. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.



Biography

Lt Col Michael Curley is assigned to the Air War College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, AL. He graduated from the United States Air Force Academy in 1995 with a Bachelor of Science in Psychology and in 2007 from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (Worldwide) with a Master of Aeronautical Science. He is a command pilot in the A-10 Thunderbolt II with over 3,200 hours and multiple combat deployments. In his most recent assignment, he was the Squadron Commander of the 357th Fighter Squadron, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, AZ.



Abstract

The United States Air Force has a long history of successful recruitment, selection, development, and retention programs to maintain the right quality and quantity of airmen to accomplish its mission. However, study of the millennial generation has highlighted the need for personnel reform within the Air Force in order to better manage and retain talent based on the evolution of technology, shifting values of generations, and societal norms. The Air Force must institutionalize greater flexibility within its personnel system that takes into account four unique millennial characteristics and the ever shifting demographics of the American workplace. The characteristics of technology, diversity, transparency, and work-life balance are central to millennials in life and career. There are four DOD “Force of the Future” proposals that most directly address the challenge of the current and future generations in the military: creation of an office of people analytics, modification of Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA), technical career tracks, and milestone based promotions. Personnel reform will ensure the Air Force meets current and future mission requirements by properly managing airmen.

Thesis

This research paper uses a qualitative approach to argue analysis of the millennial generation highlights the need for the United States Air Force to reform personnel practices in order to better execute today's and future missions.



Introduction

The United States Air Force has a unique, challenging, and critical role in American society. The Air Force must attract young volunteers to commit to an institution that is like no other business they have worked for in the past. Ideally, these young volunteers' values are in line with the core values of the Air Force: integrity first, service before self, excellence in all we do.¹ However, the recruitment and selection process is not and never will be perfect. Therefore, the Air Force has established a variety of training and education programs to equip airmen to accomplish the Air Force mission.

Throughout these programs, airmen further shape and develop their individual values, attitudes, beliefs and cultivate new ones in line with the Air Force. Regardless of how much Air Force education and training airmen receive, they are also influenced by the value system they brought to the Air Force. Furthermore, this ever evolving value system is the lens that airmen look through when progressing through life and career. Therefore, it is important the Air Force understands the values of the latest generation of volunteers and how these values, attitudes, and beliefs shift throughout life and career if the Air Force wishes to retain them.

Currently, the last members of the so-called millennial generation are entering service. This generation has been powering the Air Force since the late 1990s, and the majority of people in the Air Force are millennials.² Millennials will be the largest demographic in the Air Force for years to come so understanding what they value and believe is essential. Organizational theorists and the DOD have studied generations, and specifically millennials, for many years. Analysis of millennials highlights the need for the Air Force to reform personnel practices to develop and retain the proper quantity and quality of airmen to execute today's and future missions.

Do “Millennials” actually exist?

Before tackling Air Force personnel reform and management of airmen, it is important to understand the major theories on generations. Identifying, categorizing, and labeling a group of people is not a simple process with an agreed upon formula. Theories aid in both highlighting the complexity and bounding the problem of studying people. Using these theories, it will be important to answer two questions with regards to millennials and the Air Force: do individuals and/or groups such as millennials actually have unique characteristics that previous generations did not or do not exhibit? Second, if millennials do have unique characteristics, does it matter to the Air Force? If the answer to these two questions is yes, then the Air Force should reform personnel practices in order to develop and retain the right airmen. A brief review of the major theories on generations will help to answer these questions.

There are four major theories on generations. These theories are the maturational theory, generational theory, life course theory, and group and age norm theory. Each theory is important because no one theory comprehensively explains how people develop values, attitudes, and beliefs throughout life and career. Furthermore, there are valuable elements from each theory that help frame problems the Air Force faces with personnel practices and the quest to achieve a strong return on human capital investment.

The first theory is the maturational theory. This theory was developed by Arnold Gesell through the study of children. He believed people will “change, mature, and develop their values, attitudes, and preferences as a function of age.”³ Primarily, he took a developmental view that individuals will mature when they are biologically ready. Although external factors in the environment play some role in development, biological factors are the major determinants. Through the study of children across various ages, he determined children achieve

developmental milestones at roughly similar ages in areas such as motor skills, emotional expression, personal hygiene, an ethical sense, etc. This theory tends to downplay the role of external factors such as culture and learning in the maturation process.

The second theory is generational theory. German sociologist, Karl Mannheim, is its father, and the theory explains how attitudes and values are shaped in both individuals and groups.⁴ He believed the generation a person belongs to shapes an individual's thoughts, feelings, and beliefs. The generation is defined by significant life events during the most critical developmental stages of youth. Examples of significant life events that shaped beliefs of individuals are the experiences of the Traditionalists (1900-1945) as youths during the Great Depression or young Baby Boomers (1946-1964) during the 1960s Civil Rights Movements.⁵ This theory makes it easy to distinguish newer and older generations by differentiating between the events that may have shaped the generation or "cohort," which is a term often used interchangeably to describe a generation.

The third theory is the life course theory, which is an expansion of generational theory focused on "cohort effects."⁶ Life course theory distinguishes itself by emphasizing a constructivist view of subsequent generations. Each new generation is an ever-changing cohort that reacts to the previous generation by addressing perceived gaps in behavior which create new identities. This theory still states that powerful historical events will have significant effects on groups of people of similar age. These events become social markers that shape values, attitudes, and belief of the generation that stick with individuals for life. Examples of such events are the Great Depression, World Wars, Kennedy and King assassinations, fall of the Berlin Wall, etc.⁷ Unlike in generational theory, influential events can occur at any time throughout life, not just during youth. This theory was subsequently updated and clarified to explain that events which

occur during an individual's lifetime, not just learned through study of history, and particularly during youth (but not exclusive to youth) have the greatest impact on their values, attitudes, and beliefs.⁸

The fourth and final major theory is group and age norm theory. Every generation derives shared meaning from the environment and themselves. This theory states that a cohort strengthens its individual identity by comparisons to other cohorts. This social comparison strengthens in-group similarity and cohesion and exaggerates differences between generations.⁹ An example of social comparison is the oft joked, "we did not have that when I was a kid," comment about a variety of items that older generations make to a younger generation. In essence, this theory solidifies the boundaries of each generation and codifies the norms within a generation.

The literature review highlights three major takeaways pertinent to answering the first question of whether millennials exist as a unique group. First, human evolution has not changed significantly from baby boomers (currently, the senior leaders in the Air Force) to millennials. The maturation process, especially during youth, occurs roughly at the same pace across multiple generations (maturation theory). Second, significant life events, especially during impressionable youth years, have shaped individuals and similarly-aged groups' attitudes, values, and beliefs (generational theory, life course theory). Third, over time these attitudes, values, and beliefs have become normalized within generations and have exaggerated differences between other cohorts (group and age norm theory).

These three takeaways answer the first question posed by showing that millennials do exist as a unique group. However, the difference between millennials and previous generations is not as significant as it is often stated. An 18 year-old millennial is only slightly different than an

once 18 year-old baby boomer, and all young adults regardless of generation have a lot of maturation ahead of them. As millennials experience life and career, their attitudes, values, and beliefs will evolve like generations before them, just under a slightly different context that will contribute to their own unique identity. Therefore, it is important to recognize the uniqueness of millennials as they enter the Air Force and cultivate their attitudes, values, and beliefs. Next, a review of millennial characteristics will answer the first and second questions.

Millennials and Careers--Why the Air Force Cares

Currently, the Air Force recruits the largest portion of its applicants from the millennial generation. There are other naming conventions used to describe this generation, such as Generation Y, GenNext, and the Google Generation but the most common descriptor has evolved as the millennials.¹⁰ This generation is roughly defined as being born between 1980 and 2000 (ranging plus or minus 4 years on the front end and minus 4 years on the back end), depending on the research consulted.^{11,12,13,14} Significant research exists on this generation because they are the fastest growing segment of workers today.¹⁵ Most organizations actively recruit people from this age group and will manage them for years to come.

Appendix A describes common characteristics of the millennial generation in comparison to other recent generations in the workplace. After analyzing the conclusions from these generational studies, two overarching concepts are worth discussing regarding millennials. First, millennials have some unique characteristics formed by the evolution of American society. These characteristics are technology, diversity, transparency, and work-life balance. Second, millennials demonstrate a values shift in the way Americans think of a career. Millennial characteristics and the evolution of the American career require further discussion.

There are unique values and characteristics of millennials that do not appear to be tied to specific life stages or previous generations. The influence of technology on millennials is one of the most recognized differences from previous generations.^{16,17} Boomers, Gen Xers, and others have certainly had influence from new technologies such as radio, televisions, home computers, etc. However, millennials have consistently had much greater access to global data via the internet and global media enabled by mobile computing devices such as cellular phones, laptop computers, and tablets. The American society relies more than ever on technology for daily life and demands fluency in use of technology to accomplish once analog tasks. Millennials have embraced technology in daily life more than any previous generation. In addition, they are the first generation that does not rely on or require an authority figure to access information.¹⁸

Technology enables, and in some cases, provides context for three other unique attributes of the millennial generation. The first is ethnic diversity. Millennials are the most ethnically diverse generation.¹⁹ Evolution of a free American society with shifting demographics and continued population growth explains this on a numerical level. However, nearly unrestricted access by American society to low-cost devices with global data has created limitless possibilities for the latest generation, regardless of social status, race, or gender. The evolution of America's policies for equal rights to all citizens has enabled diversity to be a key component of millennial's daily function, where in previous generations it may have been stifled in the workplace, only to manifest itself in private life. Furthermore, the evolution and acceptance of social media has opened even the private lives of individuals to a greater audience.

Also, shifting gender roles in the latest generations of Americans, including millennials, have been large contributors to diversity in the workplace. Many young female Baby Boomers and older female Gen-Xers pursued professional degrees and training opportunities to compete in

a more gender neutral workplace. Gender policies in America have evolved to recognize women as an equal partner in the workplace, and mothers are working at rates 15% higher than in previous generations.²⁰ Therefore, it is more likely that both mothers and fathers of millennials worked.²¹ Shifting societal norms on gender have influenced millennials ideas about careers because they have witnessed both parents experience in a diverse work environment.

Transparency is the third desire unique to millennials. In particular, millennials value transparency with regards to career decisions, compensation, and rewards.²² Millennials are interconnected vertically and horizontally across organizations due to social media and being savvy at finding and accessing information. If supervisors and leaders are not accurate and forthright with discussions on careers with millennials, they will look to other sources to inform their decisions. Therefore, they value and expect transparency, which usually manifests itself in the form of mentorship and honest, direct feedback at regular intervals. Mentorship and feedback show millennials they and their work are valued and emphasize a sense of teamwork towards a common goal.

The fourth major attribute of millennials is their value of a work-life balance. Work-life balance is one of the most important values to millennials.^{23,24} From an outsider or even an organizational perspective, this may have a negative connotation that the person is not committed or is selfish. This is not true. Millennials want challenging and meaningful work, just like previous generations of Americans. However, they have seen their parents get divorced at higher rates than previous generations and experienced their mothers struggle with balancing career and family life as gender neutrality expanded in the workplace.²⁵ As millennials mature and raise families of their own, they do not want their careers to negatively impact their families as they

observed when they were young. Wives and husbands have equal opportunities to pursue professional careers, and they do not want families and careers to be mutually exclusive.

Evolution of the Concept of “Career”

Through extensive research and study of people, organizational theorists have hypothesized since the mid-1970s that Americans may have “an emerging view of careers.”²⁶ One of the most authoritative researchers on careers, Douglas Hall, coined the term “protean” career. This word originates “from the name of the Greek god Proteus, who could change shape at will, from wild boar to fire to tree.”²⁷ This describes the shifting nature of a protean career.

“In the protean career...attitudes, identity, and adaptability are simply more salient than they are in traditional careers. Almost by definition, since the protean person feels responsible for the long-run management of his life, he is more likely to be confronted by self-generated questions involving attitudes (‘How do I feel about the work I am doing?’), identity, (‘Now that I’m 45, what do I want to be when I grow up?’), and adaptability (‘How can I maintain my flexibility and freedom in the coming years?’).²⁸

Table 1 summarizes the differences between a protean career and a traditional career as it was originally envisioned in 1976.²⁹ The reality is that both the military and private sector have acknowledged and incorporated many protean concepts into their personnel management programs. As a result, people have much more control over their careers and are less tightly tied to a particular organization or occupation. Furthermore, with respect to millennial values, such as their high-value of work-life balance, organizations have had to modify rigid personnel practices to retain the right individuals and get a return on their training investment. In a global survey of over 900 business executives by *The Economist*, 62% responded that flexible working arrangements were the most important factor in recruitment and retention.³⁰

The Air Force mission of national defense is not the same as a private sector business mission. It is one of the reasons the Air Force is structured the way it is today. However, to answer the second question posed, the unique characteristics of millennials matter to the Air Force because if they are not addressed in some manner or another, the millennial labor pool will take their skills to the private sector. The training and education cost to the Air Force will remain high because at the first opportunity, airmen will leave the Air Force creating a need for more recruiting and training.

Airmen are interconnected within and outside the Air Force more than ever. They truly are members of a larger career network and are individualized, self-directed, “free agents.”³¹ The Air Force will lose airmen to the private sector if they do not continue to formalize protean concepts in the personnel system to compete with some of the options that have evolved outside the DOD. By providing more flexible career options within the Air Force and across the DOD the Air Force will receive a greater return on their investment in human capital.

Recommendations

The Air Force track record on recruitment, selection, development, and retention of its people is actually quite good. The Air Force has met and excelled at global missions in times of both war and peace in well over a half century. However, there is always room for improvement, especially in times of shrinking budgets and increased global uncertainty. The study of the millennial generation and other generations in the workplace has highlighted the need for personnel reform in the Air Force to maintain the competitive edge with its people. The Under Secretary of Defense has developed a number of proposals for personnel reform in its “Force of the Future” report.³² Based on the study of generations, particularly millennials, and organizational research with regards to the evolving idea of careers, the DOD, and especially the

Air Force, would benefit from adopting a number of the proposals. The most important proposals for a technological service, such as the Air Force, will be discussed.

Each service has several unique core functions, which only that specific service is suited to accomplish. In general, each service is focused on a domain such as land, sea, air, space, and cyber. Across the services there is some overlap in functions and capabilities in order to ensure integration, understanding, and combined arms competence across the full spectrum of conflict. However, the Air Force is striving to achieve dominance in the ever expanding domains of air, space, and cyberspace. Consequently, Air Force core capabilities are inextricably linked to technology. Furthermore, since air, space, and cyber overlap operations of all other domains, airmen must have a comprehensive understanding of the effects of their operations on those of the other services. “Tactical” Air Force operations may have greater operational or strategic effects on the battlespace than tactical operations of the other services. Therefore, the competencies of airmen are often quite unique and demand more rigorous recruitment, selection, and development than that of other services.

Of the many sound proposals in the “Force of the Future” report, there are four proposals that are of utmost importance to the improvement of Air Force personnel practices. The most important reform proposals are centered on technology and career flexibility. Technology is one of the unique characteristics and enablers of the millennial generation and is a key component of Air Force function. Based on the shifting concept of a career, personnel system flexibility is necessary to retain the best individuals and achieve a greater return on investment for airmen’s technical training and education required by the Air Force mission.

The first of four reforms is the establishment of a DOD personnel analysis office. Personnel system design and flexibility cannot be achieved without effective analysis. Just as

intelligence informs operations, strategic leaders need expert analysis to inform them of personnel challenges before they are at a point where they impact the mission. The private sector has placed greater emphasis on “people analytics” in order to preserve their investment in human capital.³³ The Air Force cannot afford to lose quality people with unique training and experience because it is unable to effectively analyze internal and external personnel challenges in a timely manner. A properly resourced and structured office of people analytics to inform strategic leaders on personnel management challenges and solutions is critical to compete with the private sector for talent.

The remaining three important proposals to the Air Force are milestone-based promotions, technical career tracks, and the modification of the Defense Officer Personnel Act (DOPMA). In order to enable milestone-based promotions and technical career tracks, the “up or out” provision of DOPMA would have to be relaxed. However, all of these reforms address the need for greater flexibility in the promotion system and are tied to the technological culture of the Air Force, values of millennials, and the nature of the protean career. Currently, officers are managed in approximately three-year batches based on the year they entered service. If specific milestones are not met in time, the officer becomes un-promotable. However, this does not mean an airman is not of great value to the Air Force nor does it mean the airman wants to leave the Air Force.

Many of the tech-influenced career specialties in the Air Force require significant training. Therefore, compared to other services, it can be challenging to meet career milestone requirements. Furthermore, since many technical specialties require so much education and training, it takes a long time to achieve credibility and mastery. Often, airmen reach fixed milestones in the current Air Force promotion system before or just as they are achieving

credibility. Furthermore, individuals at the middle career stage are normally trying to balance the task of mastery in their specialty with revised socio-emotional needs—often centered on personal identity and work-life balance.³⁴

By relaxing up or out provisions, airmen would not be constrained to meet rigid time-based milestones that force them to choose between a military career or service separation when they are at the peak of mastery. Too often, millennials are choosing life instead of work because the Air Force personnel system forces them to choose one or the other. They must strive for leadership opportunities and possibly leave their specialty, even though they have no desire to command at a higher level or leave their specialty. Technical career tracks provide an option for the Air Force to retain capability and get a return on the investment in human capital while allowing individuals to seek or maintain mastery in a specialty that they would have otherwise taken to the private sector.

Within technical career tracks, certifications and milestone based promotions would be necessary. Qualifications, currencies, and education would be critical tangible elements to stratify members. However, across specialties, milestone based promotions and proper tracking of knowledge, skills, and behavior requirements for jobs would assist leaders and managing talent. In addition, technical career track options and milestone based promotions will aid in permeability between specialties, other services, and the National Guard and Reserves. Service member talent could move more easily within the DOD where needed instead of being lost to the private sector. The DOD's net loss from human capital investment could be much less.

Conclusion

The Air Force has a distinguished track record of success in contributing to America's security. This success has been fueled by its airmen. These airmen were effectively recruited and

selected from a diverse civilian population based on their foundational values, attitudes, and beliefs. The Air Force subsequently made significant investments in training and education programs to develop airmen during careers to execute unique airpower functions that contribute to the nation's defense. During service, and as airmen mature and progress through the course of life and career, their values, attitudes, and beliefs continue to shift and solidify as they find their own identity.

The Air Force makes a significant investment in human capital because its unique capabilities are realized only by training and educating airmen in unique mission sets. Therefore, the Air Force must retain the right quantity of airmen who have embodied core values and have undertaken costly specialized training and education programs. The study of generations and careers, particularly with regard to millennials, highlights the need for the Air Force to reform personnel practices in order to better manage talent.

Generational theories highlight that there are unique attributes of the millennial generation that the Air Force must address through personnel reform. The unique values, attitudes, and beliefs of millennials are centered on the influence of technology, diversity, transparency, and an increased value on work-life balance. The DOD's "Force of the Future" report proposes a number of initiatives to address current challenges in talent management related to millennials.

The Air Force would receive the greatest benefit from the adoption of four proposals in particular. These four proposals all address the prevalence of technology in Air Force careers and the millennial generation's high value of career flexibility to achieve work-life balance. The first proposal is the DOD wide establishment of an office of people analytics to inform strategic leadership on talent management. Second is the relaxing of DOPMA, which increases

permeability, flexibility, and enables the final two recommendations. The last two recommendations are the establishment of technical career paths and milestone based promotions. Reforming current personnel practices to incorporate these proposals will enable the Air Force to better execute todays and future missions.



Notes

¹ United States Air Force. Air Force Instruction 1-1, Air Force Standards, 12 Nov 2014, accessed 29 Nov 15, http://static.e-publishing.af.mil/production/1/af_cc/publication/afi1-1/afi1-1.pdf

² Air Force Personnel Center. "Air Force Demographics," United States Air Force, 30 Sep 2015, accessed 23 Nov 15, <http://www.Afpc.Af.mil/library/airforcepersoneldemographics.asp>

³ Chip Espinoza, Mick Ukleja, and Craig Rusch. *Managing the Millennials: Discover the Core Competencies for Managing Today's Workforce*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010, p. 14.

⁴ Chip Espinoza, Mick Ukleja, and Craig Rusch. *Managing the Millennials: Discover the Core Competencies for Managing Today's Workforce*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010, p. 15

⁵ Lynne C. Lancaster and David Stillman. *When Generations Collide: Who They Are, Why They Clash, How to Solve the Generational Puzzle at Work*. New York: HarperCollins, 2002, pp. 18-21.

⁶ Chip Espinoza, Mick Ukleja, and Craig Rusch. *Managing the Millennials: Discover the Core Competencies for Managing Today's Workforce*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010, p. 16.

⁷ Chip Espinoza, Mick Ukleja, and Craig Rusch. *Managing the Millennials: Discover the Core Competencies for Managing Today's Workforce*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010, p. 16.

⁸ Chip Espinoza, Mick Ukleja, and Craig Rusch. *Managing the Millennials: Discover the Core Competencies for Managing Today's Workforce*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010, p. 17.

⁹ Chip Espinoza, Mick Ukleja, and Craig Rusch. *Managing the Millennials: Discover the Core Competencies for Managing Today's Workforce*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010, p. 18.

¹⁰ Lynne C. Lancaster and David Stillman. *The M-factor: How the Millennial Generation Is Rocking the Workplace*. New York: HarperBusiness, 2010, p. 5.

¹¹ Chip Espinoza, Mick Ukleja, and Craig Rusch. *Managing the Millennials: Discover the Core Competencies for Managing Today's Workforce*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010, pp. 6-7.

¹² Lynne C. Lancaster and David Stillman. *When Generations Collide: Who They Are, Why They Clash, How to Solve the Generational Puzzle at Work*. New York: HarperCollins, 2002, p. 13.

¹³ Ron Zemke, Claire Raines, and Bob Filipczak. *Generations at Work Managing the Clash of Boomers, Gen Xers, and Gen Yers in the Workplace*. New York: American Management Association, 2013, p. 24.

¹⁴ Lynne C. Lancaster, and David Stillman. *The M-factor: How the Millennial Generation Is Rocking the Workplace*. New York: HarperBusiness, 2010, p. 5.

¹⁵ Lynne C. Lancaster, and David Stillman. *The M-factor: How the Millennial Generation Is Rocking the Workplace*. New York: HarperBusiness, 2010, p. 5.

¹⁶ Jill Newman. "Leading Generation Y." U.S. Army War College, 15 Mar 2008, p. 23.

¹⁷ Chip Espinoza, Mick Ukleja, and Craig Rusch. *Managing the Millennials: Discover the Core Competencies for Managing Today's Workforce*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010, p. 14.

¹⁸ Chip Espinoza, Mick Ukleja, and Craig Rusch. *Managing the Millennials: Discover the Core Competencies for Managing Today's Workforce*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010, p. 14.

¹⁹ Casey Wardynski, David Lyle, and Michael Colarusso. "Accessing Talent: The Foundation of a U.S. Army Officer." Strategic Studies Institute, 1 Feb. 2010, accessed 30 Sept. 2015.

<http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB972.pdf>, p. 26.

²⁰ Department of Labor. Labor Force Participation Rates, accessed 25 Oct 2015, http://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/facts_over_time.htm#labor

²¹ Carolyn A. Martin and Bruce Tulgan. *Managing Generation Y: Global Citizens born in the Late Seventies and Early Eighties*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press, 2001, p. 19.

²² University of Southern California and London Business School, "PwC's Nextgen: A Global Generational Study," 2013, accessed 2 Dec 2015, <http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/services/people-organisation/publications/nextgen-study.html>

²³ Chip Espinoza, Mick Ukleja, and Craig Rusch. *Managing the Millennials: Discover the Core Competencies for Managing Today's Workforce*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010, p. 50.

²⁴ David Barno and Nora Bensahel. "Can the U.S. Military Halt its Brain Drain?" *The Atlantic*. 5 Nov 2015, accessed 5 Nov 2015, <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/11/us-military-tries-halt-brain-drain/413965/>

²⁵ Douglas T. Hall. *Careers in and out of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2002, p. 90-91.

²⁶ Douglas T. Hall, *Careers in Organizations*. Goodyear Publishing Company, 1976, p. 200.

²⁷ Douglas T. Hall *The Career Is Dead--long Live the Career: A Relational Approach to Careers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996, p. 20.

²⁸ Douglas T. Hall. *Careers in and out of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2002, p. 302.

²⁹ Douglas T. Hall. *Careers in and out of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2002, p. 303.

³⁰ The Economist Intelligence Unit. "Talent Wars: The Struggle for Tomorrow's Workforce," Report from *The Economist Intelligence Unit*, 2008, accessed 28 Nov 2015, http://graphics.eiu.com/upload/SAP_talent.pdf

³¹ Douglas T. Hall. *Careers in and out of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2002, p. 310.

³² Undersecretary of Defense. "Force of the Future, Final Report: Reform Proposals" (Pre-decisional), 3 Aug 2015, p. 4.

³³ Undersecretary of Defense. "Force of the Future, Final Report: Reform Proposals" (Pre-decisional), 3 Aug 2015, p. 6.

³⁴ Douglas T. Hall. *Careers in and out of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2002, p. 124.

Appendix A

	Baby Boomers	Generation X	Millennials
Years	1946-1964 (Smola and Sutton, 2002)	1965-1978 (Smola and Sutton, 2002)	1979 -2000 (Zemke, Raines, Filipczak, 2013)
Era	American High (Howe and Strauss, 2000)	Consciouness Revolution (Howe and Strauss, 2000)	Culture Wars & Roaring Nineties (Howe and Strauss, 2000)
Presidents	Truman to Kennedy (Howe and Strauss, 2000)	LBJ to Carter (Howe and Strauss, 2000)	Reagan to Clinton (Howe and Strauss, 2000)
Technology	Broadcast TV 78s and LPs 8mm Film Vacuum Tubes Mainframes Sedans and Station Wagons Electric ranges (Howe and Strauss, 2000)	Cable TV Cassettes and CDs VCRs Transistors Calculators Beetles and hatchbacks Microwaves (Howe and Strauss, 2000)	Interactive TV Streaming and MP3s DVDs Microchips Personal computers Minivans and SUVs Delivered foods (Howe and Strauss, 2000)
Defining Events	Vietnam Civil Rights Riots Kennedys Watergate Woodstock (Smola and Sutton, 2002)	Fall of Berlin Wall MTV AIDS Latch-key kids Working parents / divorce (Smola and Sutton, 2002)	Internet chat School violence TV Talk shows Multiculturalism Girls' movement McGuire and Sosa (Zemke, 2001)
Characteristics	Optimism Teamwork Driven Willingness to go the extra mile (Zemke, 2001) Idealism Individualism High expectations (Cufaude, 2000) Desires teamwork, relationships, and bonding	Determined Individualists Fiercely independent Wants to set own goals, deadlines, and work hours Thrive upon a creative and chaotic environment Competitive Risk-taking (Jurkiewicz, 2000) Diversity Thinking Globally	Team-oriented Optimistic Poised for greatness on a global scale Embraces law and order, morality, diversity, and problem solving Technology planners Community-shapers Institution-builders (Howe and Strauss, 2000) Confidence

	<p>Loyal until the next job offer comes along (Pekala, 2001)</p> <p>Lonely individualism Cynicism and distrust of government (Meredith and Schewe, 2002)</p>	<p>Technoliteracy Informality Self-reliance Risk-takers Skeptical Family Oriented Focused on job not work hours (Zemke, 2001)</p> <p>Pragmatism Entrepreneurial spirit Savviness (Cufaude, 2000)</p> <p>Distrustful of authority but respects mentors Loyal to individuals, not companies Very tech-savvy Highly task-oriented Can be counted on to get work done on time Have high energy level Need challenge (Pekala, 2001)</p> <p>Free agency and independence Street smart (Meredith and Schewe, 2002)</p>	<p>Street smart Tenacious (Zemke, 2001)</p> <p>Mindful of authority Cautiously optimistic outlook Enthusiasm for the future (Pekala, 2001)</p> <p>Tolerance and diversity Respect for institutions (Meredith and Schewe, 2002)</p>
Focus/Concerns	<p>Concerned with retirement issues More concerned with quality of life than with money (Junkiewicz, 2000)</p> <p>Health and Wellness Personal Gratification Personal Growth</p>	<p>Focused on child care Willing to trade off high compensation for leisure time (Junkiewicz, 2000)</p> <p>Balance Fun (Zemke, 2001)</p>	<p>Civic duty Achievement Sociability Morality Diversity (Zemke, 2001)</p> <p>Compartmentalized work and life</p>

	<p>(Zemke, 2001)</p> <p>Self-improvement (Cufaude, 2000)</p> <p>Personal and social expression</p> <p>Protected individualism</p> <p>Family commitments (Meredith and Schewe, 2002)</p>	<p>Quality of life (Cufaude, 2000)</p> <p>Value flextime and balance</p> <p>Demand interesting work, praise and recognition</p> <p>Want financial stability without giving loyalty in return (Pekala, 2001)</p> <p>Friendships important</p> <p>Pursuit of quality of life (Meredith and Schewe, 2002)</p> <p>Respect, support and honor (Tulgan, 1996)</p>	<p>(Cufaude, 2000)</p> <p>Expect to start at the top like their Gen X counterpart</p> <p>Mentoring is a top priority</p> <p>Flexibility and personalities are very important (Pekala, 2001)</p> <p>Belonging to a global community (Meredith and Schewe, 2002)</p>
Beliefs, Attitudes, Values	<p>“Let’s have a meeting”</p> <p>“Thank god it’s Monday” (Zemke, 2001)</p> <p>Sacrifices everything for the job; believes in paying dues (Pekala, 2001)</p> <p>Conformity and being pro-business</p> <p>“Don’t rock the boat” work ethic (Meredith and Schewe, 2002)</p> <p>“Me generation”</p> <p>“I’m OK, you’re OK” (Schewe, Meredith, and Noble, 2001)</p>	<p>“It’s only a job” (Zemke, 2001)</p> <p>Work until I get the job done</p> <p>I will work harder for time than money</p> <p>Willing to quit a job with no other job in sight</p> <p>View work simply as a means to support the leisure time (Pekala, 2001)</p> <p>“What’s in it for me?” (Schewe, Meredith, and Noble, 2001)</p>	<p>“It takes a village” (Zemke, 2001)</p> <p>Change is good (Meredith and Schewe, 2002)</p>

Skibo, p. 52, 2004.

Table 1: Differences between the Protean and Traditional Career

Issue	Protean Career	Traditional Career
Who's in charge	Person	Organization
Core values	Freedom, growth	Advancement, power
Degree of mobility	High	Lower
Important performance dimensions	Psychological Success	Position level, salary
Important attitude dimensions	Work satisfaction,, professional commitment	Organizational commitment
Important identity dimensions	Do I respect myself? (self-esteem) What do I want to do? (self-awareness)	Am I respected by this organization? (esteem from others) What should I do? (organizational awareness)
Important adaptability dimensions	Work-related flexibility Current competence (measure: marketability)	Organization-related flexibility (measure organizational survival)

Hall, p. 202, 1976.

Bibliography

Barno, David and Nora Bensahel. "Can the U.S. Military Halt its Brain Drain?" *The Atlantic*. 5 Nov 2015, accessed 5 Nov 2015, <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/11/us-military-tries-halt-brain-drain/413965/>

Browne, James S. "Air Force Leadership Development: Transformation's Constant." Air University Press, March 2003.

Cufaude, J. Cultivating new leadership. *Association Management*, 52, 73-78, 2000.

Department of Labor. Labor Force Participation Rates, accessed 25 Oct 2015, http://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/facts_over_time.htm#labor

The Economist Intelligence Unit. "Talent Wars: The Struggle for Tomorrow's Workforce," Report from *The Economist* Intelligence Unit, 2008, accessed 28 Nov 2015, http://graphics.eiu.com/upload/SAP_talent.pdf

Espinoza, Chip, Mick Ukleja, and Craig Rusch. *Managing the Millennials: Discover the Core Competencies for Managing Today's Workforce*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2010.

Finegold, David, Susan Mohrman, and Gretchen M. Spreitzer. "Age effects on the predictors of technical workers' commitment and willingness to turnover." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*: 23, 655-674. 2002.

Griswold, Kevin. "Reducing Military Spouse Unemployment and Wage Gaps." Georgetown Public Policy Institute.

Hall, Douglas T. *Careers in Organizations*. Goodyear Publishing Company, 1976.

Hall, Douglas T. *Career Development in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.

Hall, Douglas T. *The Career Is Dead--long Live the Career: A Relational Approach to Careers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Hall, Douglas T. *Careers in and out of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2002.

Howe, N. & Strauss, W. *Millennials rising the next great generation*. New York: Random House, Inc, 2000.

Jurkiewicz, C. Generation X and the public employee. *Public Personnel Management*, 29, 55-76, 2000.

Lamson, Chris A., "The Career Officer Attrition Dilemma: An underlying Cause." U.S. Army War College, October 2002.

Lancaster, Lynne C., and David Stillman. *When Generations Collide: Who They Are, Why They Clash, How to Solve the Generational Puzzle at Work*. New York: HarperCollins, 2002.

Lancaster, Lynne C., and David Stillman. *The M-factor: How the Millennial Generation Is Rocking the Workplace*. New York: HarperBusiness, 2010.

Lim, Nelson, Daniela Golinelli, Michelle Cho, "Working Around the Military Revisited." Santa Monica, Calif: RAND Corporation, 2007.

Martin, Carolyn A. and Bruce Tulgan. *Managing Generation Y: Global Citizens born in the Late Seventies and Early Eighties*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press, 2001.

Meredith, G., Schewe, C. & Karlovich J. *Defining Markets, Defining Moments America's 7 Generational Cohorts, Their Shared Experiences, and Why Business Should Care*. New York: Hungry Minds, Inc, 2002.

Newman, Jill. "Leading Generation Y." U.S. Army War College, 15 Mar 2008.

Paul, P. Getting inside Gen Y. *American Demographics*, 23, 42-49, 2001.

Pekala, N. Conquering the generational divide. *Journal of Property Management*, Nov/Dec, 30-38, 2001.

Schewe, C., Meredith, G., & Noble, S. Defining moments: Segmenting by cohorts. *Marketing Management*, 9, 48-53, 2001.

Skibo, Stephanie M. "An Analysis of Generational Differences Among Active Duty Members." Ft. Belvoir: Defense Technical Information Center, 2004.

Smola, Karen Wey and Charlotte D. Sutton. "Generational Differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*: 23, 363-382, 2002.

Tulgan, Bruce. Correcting the "slacker myth" – managing Generation X in the workplace. *Manage*, 48, 14-16, 1996.

Tulgan, Bruce, and Carolyn A. Martin. *Managing Generation Y Global Citizens Born in the Late Seventies and Early Eighties*. Amherst, Mass.: HRD, 2001.

Undersecretary of Defense. "Force of the Future, Final Report: Reform Proposals" (Pre-decisional), 3 Aug 2015.

University of Southern California and London Business School, "PwC's Nextgen: A Global Generational Study," 2013, accessed 2 Dec 2015, <http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/services/people-organisation/publications/nextgen-study.html>

Wardynski, Casey, David Lyle, and Michael Colarusso. "Accessing Talent: The Foundation of a U.S. Army Officer." Strategic Studies Institute, 1 Feb. 2010, accessed 30 Sept. 2015. <<http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB972.pdf>>

Wong, Leonard. "Generations Apart: Xers and Boomers in the Officer Corps." U.S. Army Strategic Studies Institute, 2000.

Zemke, Ron. "Here come the Millennials." *Training*. 38, 44-49, 2001.

Zemke, Ron, Claire Raines, and Bob Filipczak. *Generations at Work Managing the Clash of Boomers, Gen Xers, and Gen Yers in the Workplace*. New York: American Management Association, 2013.